



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

m-f

| APPLICATION NO.   | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/669,332  | 09/25/2003  | Toshihiro Kadowaki   | 03560.002196.1      | 4130             |
| 5514  | 7590        | 08/09/2006           | EXAMINER            |                  |
| FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO<br>30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA<br>NEW YORK, NY 10112 |             |                      | LEE, TOMMY D        |                  |
|   |             |                      | ART UNIT            | PAPER NUMBER     |
|   |             |                      | 2625                |                  |

DATE MAILED: 08/09/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|                              |                                      |  |  |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|--|
| <b>Office Action Summary</b> | <b>Application No.</b><br>10/669,332 | <b>Applicant(s)</b><br>KADOWAKI, TOSHIHIRO |  |
|                              | <b>Examiner</b><br>Thomas D. Lee     | <b>Art Unit</b><br>2625                    |  |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 May 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 11-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 11-32 and 34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 33 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Response to Amendment***

1. This Office action is responsive to applicant's amendment filed May 25, 2006.  
Claims 11-34 are pending.

### ***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments filed in response to the rejections of claims 11-29 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) or 103(a) as set forth in the prior Office action have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's arguments on pages 14-17 of the current amendment are based on the claims *as amended to overcome the prior rejections*. New grounds for rejection based on the amended claims are set forth below.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The recitation, "selecting among a plurality [sic] of languages *a language to identification information the operation screen based on the user ID entered in said entering step.*" (emphasis added) This recitation is unclear. It would appear that applicant meant to indicate that a language appearing on the operation screen is selected, based the identification information entered in the entering step.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

6. Claims 11-21, 23-26, 28 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,818,606 (Muramatsu) in view of U.S. Patent 5,907,319 (Hashimoto).

Regarding claims 11, 12, 14, 15, 20, 21, 26, 28 and 29, Muramatsu discloses an image processing apparatus comprising: an input unit, adapted to input image data (image reading device IR (column 4, lines 3-10)); a processor, adapted to perform a job based on the image data input by said input unit (image data processing unit 20 (column 4, lines 3-10)); an operation unit, adapted to display an operation screen for the job to be performed by said processor and accept a user operation based on the operation screen (operation panel OP (column 5, lines 24-38)); an entering unit, adapted to enter a user ID and machine group ID (ten-key pad 92 (column 5, lines 24-38; column 11, line 54 – column 12, line 4), mode switch key 98 (column 5, lines 39-50)). Said input unit inputs the image data obtained by reading an image on a document (scanning optical system 10 (column 4, lines 3-10)). Said processor performs a sending job for sending the image data input by said input unit to a designated destination (user enters destination telephone number for facsimile transmission (column 11, lines 34-50)).

Muramatsu does not disclose a controller, adapted to change parameters to be displayed on the operation screen of said operation unit based on the user ID entered

Art Unit: 2625

by said entering unit, the parameters being for processing the image data inputted by said input unit and being selectable by a user corresponding to the user ID entered by said entering unit, and change an arrangement of one key corresponding to a predetermined function for the job to be performed by said processor in the operation screen of said operation unit based on the user ID entered by said entering unit (In Muramatsu, the user ID is entered when the apparatus is in the copy mode, and copy operation is either allowed or prohibited based on the entered ID number (column 11, line 54 – column 12, line 4), but parameters of the copy processes are not changed). However, as mentioned in the prior Office action at page 3, the above controller is disclosed by Hashimoto (read Abstract; column 12, lines 26-60). One of ordinary skill would have recognized, in view of Hashimoto, that by providing for the changing of copy parameters based on user identification, users of different levels of skill may use the apparatus for copying documents, and a wider variety of copying operations may be provided, thereby enhancing the versatility of the apparatus. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teaching of Muramatsu by providing a controller for changing copy parameters based on user identification, such as disclosed in Hashimoto.

Regarding claims 13 and 16-19, Hashimoto discloses wherein said controller controls the operation screen of a reading parameter for reading the image based on the user ID entered by said entering unit (Figs. 17 and 27; column 12, lines 61-65); what language is displayed on the operation screen (column 8, lines 45-63); the number of user selectable items to be displayed on said operation unit (Abstract; column 9, lines

10-21); the number of operation screens displayed, for instructing a predetermined job execution to be displayed on said operation unit (simple and standard (Abstract)); and said operation unit for displaying a common operation screen without a user ID being entered by said entering unit (column 10, lines 10-56).

Regarding claims 23-25, the claims further recite the use of a card to enter the user ID and machine group ID; control of the operation screen corresponding to the user ID entered by said entering unit prior to being cleared, if the card is removed or a predetermined period of time elapses after the card is moved away. While these limitations are not disclosed in Muramatsu, Hashimoto, as mentioned on pages 3 and 4 of the prior Office action, discloses entering the ID using a card (column 8, lines 53-66) and that after a predetermined time elapses the control unit clears the screen (column 13, lines 14-19). The use of an ID card enables quicker entry of ID information than entry by means of pressing keys in Muramatsu, and further enables a user to use the apparatus without having to memorize his/her user ID. Furthermore, clearing the screen after a predetermined time elapses eliminates the need to manually clear the screen, thereby further saving time and effort. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to further modify the teaching of Muramatsu by providing means for entering a user ID by using a card, as disclosed in Hashimoto.

7. Claims 22, 27, 30-32 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Muramatsu in view of U.S. Patent 5,177,621 (Ohtaki) and U.S. Patent 5,535,120 (Chong).

Regarding claims 22 and 27, Muramatsu discloses an image processing apparatus comprising: an input unit, adapted to input image data (image reading device IR (column 4, lines 3-10)); a processor, adapted to perform a job based on the image data input by said input unit (image data processing unit 20 (column 4, lines 3-10)); an operation unit, adapted to display an operation screen for the job to be performed by said processor and accept a user operation based on the operation screen (operation panel OP (column 5, lines 24-38)); and an entering unit, adapted to enter identification information corresponding to a user (ten-key pad 92 (column 5, lines 24-38; column 11, line 54 – column 12, line 4)).

Muramatsu does not disclose a controller, adapted to select, from among a plurality of languages, a language used for a term to be displayed in the operation screen of said operation unit based on the identification information entered by said entering unit.

Ohtaki discloses an image reading apparatus that includes a language button for changing the language on a display screen (column 59, lines 1-6). By providing such a button, a user who may not understand instructions on a display screen can still use the apparatus by selecting a language he/she understands. Furthermore, machines with this capability can be marketed in more countries without the need for further alteration. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teaching of Muramatsu by providing a means for changing the language on the display, as disclosed in Ohtaki.

The combined teachings of Muramatsu and Ohtaki enable a user change the language on a display screen by means of a language button. However, there is no indication that the language is changed in response to entry of user identification information.

Chong discloses a machine translation system that translates input text to a language corresponding to a user ID (Abstract). While Chong does not deal specifically with translating screen instructions, the concept of changing a language based on identification information of a user is clearly taught. In view of Chong, one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized the advantage of associating user identification with a preferred language, in that a user, by entering the user identification, does not have to press a button in order to find the language he/she wishes to use. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the combined teachings of Muramatsu and Ohtaki by providing a means for associating user identification with a preferred language, such as disclosed in Chong.

Regarding claim 30, the use of languages including Japanese and English, while not explicitly disclosed in the prior art, would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, for these languages are widely used in industrialized nations such as Japan and the United States.

Regarding claim 31, Muramatsu discloses displaying a setting screen (liquid crystal touch panel 91 (Fig. 2)). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the touch panel so that a language can be set, since the touch panel is a well-known alternative to a button or set of keys for entering information, in general.

Regarding claim 32, Muramatsu discloses a plurality of terms selectable as a parameter for processing the image data inputted by said input unit (parameters shown in liquid crystal touch panel 91 (Fig. 2)).

Regarding claim 34, Muramatsu discloses wherein said processor performs the job for sending the image data input by said input unit to a designated destination (user enters destination telephone number for facsimile transmission (column 11, lines 34-50)).

#### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

8. Claim 33 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

9. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: No prior art has been found to disclose or suggest the sending of identification information to an external server, and the receiving of language information identifying the language used for the term to be displayed in the operation screen of said operation unit from the external server, wherein said controller selects the language identified by the received language information.

#### ***Conclusion***

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 2625

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thomas D. Lee whose telephone number is (571) 272-7436. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 7:30-5:00, alternate Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David K. Moore can be reached on (571) 272-7437. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2625

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Thomas D Lee  
Primary Examiner  
Technology Division 2625

tdl  
August 4, 2006